In the Matter Of:

IN Re: LTL Management, LLC

MIKAL WATTS

June 12, 2023



```
Page 1
                                                                                                                            Page 3
1
                                                                        Appearances (Continued)
    UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
    DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
                                                                            MAUNE RAICHLE HARTLEY FRENCH & MUDD, LLC
                                                                               Attorneys for Katherine Tolleson,
    In Re:
                                                                    5
                                                                                777 S Harbour Island Blvd.
                                                                                Suite 310
                                                                    6
                                                                                Tampa, Florida 33602
    LTL MANAGEMENT, LLC.
5
                                                                                BY: MARCUS RAICHLE, ESQ.
                                                                    7
                                                                                    CLAY THOMPSON. ESO.
                              Debtor.
                                                                                    CHRIS McKEAN, ESO.
7
                                                                    8
    Case No. 23-12825 (MBK)
                                                                    9
                                                                           OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE
    ----X
8
                                                                   10
                                                                                Attorneys for the United States
9
                                                                                Department of Justice
                                                                   11
                                                                                One Newark Center
10
          VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF MIKAL C. WATTS
                                                                                Suite 2100
11
                                                                   12
                                                                                Newark, New Jersey 07102
                                                                                BY: LAUREN BIELSKIE, ESQ.
12
                                                                   13
                                                                                    JEFFREY SPONDER, ESQ.
13
                                                                           OTTERBOURG, P.C.
               DATE: Monday, June 12, 2023
                                                                               Attorneys for TCC I
               TIME: 7:05 a.m. - 9:56 a.m.
15
                                                                   16
                                                                                230 Park Avenue
                                                                                30th floor
               PLACE: ***REMOTE***
                                                                   17
                                                                                New York, New York 10169
17
               BEFORE: Elizabeth M. Kondor, CCR.
                                                                                BY: JOHN BOUGIAMAS, ESQ.
                                                                   18
                                                                                    JARED OUIGLEY, ESO.
18
                                                                                    ADAM SILVERSTEIN, ESO.
19
                                                                   19
                                                                          PAUL HASTINGS, LLP
20
                                                                   2.0
                                                                                Attorneys for Ad Hoc Committee of
                                                                   21
                                                                                Supporting Counsel
22
                                                                                200 Park Avenue
                                                                   22
                                                                                New York, New York 10166
23
                                                                                BY: WILLIAM K. WHITNER, ESQ.
24
                                                                   23
                                                                                    RYAN MONTEFUSCO, ESQ.
                                                                   24
    JOB NO: 2023-898643
                                                         Page 2
                                                                                                                            Page 4
                                                                                       MIKAL C. WATTS
    APPEARANCES:
2
                                                                       Appearances (Continued)
                                                                    3
      BEASLEY ALLEN LAW FIRM
                                                                           SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP
          Attorneys for Alishia Landrom,
                                                                    4
                                                                               Attorneys for Travelers Casualty &
5
          et al.
                                                                                Surety Company
          218 Commerce Street
          Montgomery, Alabama 36104
6
                                                                    5
                                                                                425 Lexington Avenue
          BY: ANDY BIRCHFIELD, ESQ.
                                                                                New York, New York 10017
                                                                    6
                                                                                BY: JARED QUIGLEY, ESQ.
8
      BROWN RUDNICK, LLP
                                                                    8
                                                                           WOMBLE BOND DICKINSON, LLP
9
           Attorneys for the Talc Claimants
           7 Times Square
                                                                               Attorneys for Ad Hoc Committee of
           New York, New York 10036
                                                                    9
                                                                               State Attorney Generals
           BY: CAMERON MOXLEY, ESQ.
                                                                                950 3rd Avenue
               DAVID WEINSTEIN, ESQ.
11
                                                                                Suite 2400
12
                                                                               New York, New York 10022
      COLE SCHOTZ, P.C.
13
           1325 Avenue of the Americas
                                                                   11
                                                                                BY: ERICKA JOHNSON, ESO.
           19th Floor
                                                                   12
14
           New York, NY 10019
                                                                   13
           BY: SETH VAN AALTEN, ESO.
                                                                               ALSO PRESENT:
15
                                                                   14
16
      GOLOMB SPIRT GRUNFELD, PC
           1835 Market Street
                                                                   15
                                                                                DEANE CARSTENSEN,
           Suite 2900
17
           Philadelphia, PA 19103
                                                                   16
                                                                                Document technician
18
           BY: RICHARD GOLOMB, ESQ.
                                                                   17
                                                                                BRIAN SMITH, Videographer
19
                                                                   18
      JONES DAY, LLP
20
                                                                   19
           Attorneys for the Debtor
                                                                   20
21
           250 Vesey Street
           Suite 31
           New York, New York 10281
                                                                   22
           BY: MARK RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
                                                                   23
23
                OLIVER D. ROBERTS, ESO.
                                                                   2.4
24
```

1

11

DesMikal Watts June 12, 2023

Page 43

Page 41 1 MIKAL C. WATTS 2 And then 14,092 received, but that's not on a per-client basis; that's on a per-record basis. 5 Q. Okay. 6 And I know, sir, that you testified 7 previously about sort of how you acquired those 8 clients and how you came to represent them in 9 connection with this case. I don't plan to 10 cover ground we've already covered, as I 11 mentioned before. And I know that you -- and 12 I'm providing this more for context for you, 13 sir. I know that you previously testified 14 15 as well that your first engagement letter was as of March 19, 2022, correct? 17 A. I think that's roughly correct. 18 Q. Okay. 19 How many talc clients, if you know, 20 did your firm have as of the Third Circuit's January 30, 2023, decision? 21 22 A. 15,000.

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 A. I mean, I think they're either active or they're DNQ'd, so I think it's more of a subtraction. I can tell you 277 of them will 5 not be filed. And as we continue to go through the process, I would expect that number would go up some. But I think the fractions, you know, that you're looking at, you know, we'll continue to process, and we'll only file the ones that don't get disqualified.

Q. Okay.

Q. Okay.

12 But as you sit here today, have you 13 made a determination that any particular number of those claims will be filed if there is a 15 dismissal of the bankruptcy?

16 A. I'm certain that inside the database, there are thousands and thousands and thousands 17 of them. I don't have it at my fingertips right now. It's -- it's more, we're in process, and 20 there are new cases coming in and everything like that, so I don't know the answer as I sit here today. But I could tell you that, you know, based on the review of at least 14,092 24 records, 277 of them have been DQ'd.

Page 42

25

1

2

3

4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 44

MIKAL C. WATTS

Q. Okay.

Α.

Q.

Estimate.

Understood.

2 How many talc clients did your firm have as of the April 4th filing date of the 3 LTL 2? 4

(Interruption by the reporter.)

Q. The question was April 4th filing 6 7 date of LTL 2.

8 A. I think the number that's in the 9 exhibit that we just looked at that's still on 10 the screen is probably the best number for that, 11 16,935.

12 Q. Okay.

23

24

25

1

5

13 And of the 16,935 that are identified 14 in the Ad Hoc Committee of Supporting Counsel's 15 Verified Statement on the screen, zero of those

16 are filed claims, correct?

17 A. Yeah, you can't file claims when 18 there's an administrative stay.

Q. Understood.

20 For the unfiled claims, Mr. Watts,

21 how many has your firm determined that it will

22 file?

19

23

A. You mean if the bankruptcy's

24 decision --

25 Q. Yes, sir.

MIKAL C. WATTS

And beyond that, you have no other estimate of the number of filings that you'll make if the case is dismissed?

5 Not at this time, but to be fair, I haven't been back in the office in a month. You know, it's just Italy, you know, the CLE, this kind of thing. I'm not saying I couldn't 9 improve that number, but I just haven't had 10 time.

Q. For the unfiled claims, are you aware 11 12 of whether any of those clients were previously -- strike that, sir. 13 14

These are all unfiled claims, of course, as we just discussed.

For any of these claims, are you aware of whether any of those clients were previously declined by other attorneys representing talc claimants?

A. I think that what I'm -- what I'm aware of is, I don't believe that number is very large. We put a trap in during intake with respect to that. I could tell you that 21 of them showed up as dual reps. And what I can't tell you is whether that dual rep number came

June 12, 2023 Page 47

Ded Mikal Watts

Page 45

1

9

13

21

1

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 from Ms. Lounsberry, which is the whole reason

3 we put in the list of claimants, so that we

4 could get rid of the dual reps. So I just know

5 my database shows 21 dual attorneys.

Q. You mentioned that previously, and I 7 think you also mentioned sort of the breakdown of some of the others.

9 Could you give us that understanding 10 of what the different breakdowns are of the 11 current status of the complaint?

12 A. Sure. So dual attorneys obviously 13 means somebody's hired -- has been hired twice 14 or three times or four times, you know. So

15 that's 21.

6

8

16 And so whenever we do these kind of 17 mass tort resolutions, the first thing that I

18 want to do is create a deal where we get lists

19 by singular identifying numbers so that we can

20 de-dupe, which is what was assigned to

21 Ms. Lounsberry.

22 And I was pleased that there were 23 only 21. It's something that we see in every

24 tort. But that's something obviously that needs

25 to be done is, because people shouldn't get to

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 people don't follow those rules, they cease 3 being one of my vendors.

4 But we have all sorts of audit traps and quality control, if you will, to make sure that the stuff that is being intaked by the separate vending sources to whom I am paying money are meeting our rules.

Forty-seven out of 15,000 of them 10 failed because of intake failure, and so those cases were discarded, and most likely those 11 12 vendors were discarded as well.

Do you want the next one?

14 Q. Yes, please.

15 A. Yeah. So no damage is 123. That's the category that my firm uses when we run down all the different medical records, and we can't 17 find medical records that confirm the diagnosed 18 condition that we're looking for as part of the 19 20 intake criteria. So that's 123.

The next one is no interest. And, you know, I see Mr. Birchfield's picture. I 22 23 mean, we've all got the same issue here, and that is, is that cases come in in response to an 24 ad or some sort of a marketing pitch or Internet

Page 46

Page 48

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 vote twice because they've hired two lawyers.

3 You know? And so we've identified 21 of that.

In terms of dupes, there's another

5 23. That's different. And let me tell you what 6 that means.

7 Instead of dual attorneys, you have

8 dupes, and that means you have different

9 vendors. There's approximately 10 different

10 marketing vendors that I utilize things out.

11 And sometimes those different marketing vendors

12 will show up with the same case for either

13 nefarious reasons or just, you know, it happens.

14 But 23 on top of that.

In terms of intake failure, there 16 are 47.

17

15

19

4

Do you want me to tell you what that 18 means?

Q. Yes, please, sir.

20 A. Yeah. So anytime you contract with a 21 vendor, you do so pursuant to protocols, rules 22 that they're supposed to follow when they're

23 spending your money to do intake on cases.

24 For better or for worse, some vendors 25 are better and some vendors are worse. And when 25

MIKAL C. WATTS

or whatever. Clients think all I got to do is

sign up and then I'm going to get paid, and then

4 they realize they have to do work. Most of them

5 will do the work, but some of them won't. And

6 so some of them just throw up their hands and

say I don't want to do this. So 61 of the 7

16,000 have said, I don't want to do this, and

9 have been DNQ'd for no interest.

10 And then a subset of that is what we would call "nonresponsive." And that's 15 11 people, where, when the intake firm gets the 12 communications link, either an e-mail or a text 13 14 number or a phone number and the like, when our people doing the quality control are trying to 15 get ahold of those people, we just can't get 16 17 them to call us back. And so that's another 15.

And so those six categories always altogether comprise the 277 that have been disqualified thus far.

Q. Thank you, sir.

As part of the intake process that you just described, do you have or do you require documentation from the client that attests to how the product usage?

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 49

1

15

22

24

1

2

DesMikal Watts June 12, 2023 Exhibit 779 Page 5 of 10

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 A. Ask that question again. I didn't hear you. I'm sorry. 3

Q. Oh, oh, sure.

1

4

5

6

7

14

15

25

Can you hear me okay now, sir?

A. That attest to. I thought you said "test a." Okay.

8 Yes. They have to tell me that 9 they've used talcum, and we have an intake 10 criteria, I think it was a minimum of four 11 years, a certain latency period that's escaping 12 me right now. That's all something they have to 13 tell us on first base, yes.

Q. Okay.

And what sort of form does them 16 telling you that take? Is it in response to a 17 questionnaire, is it an affidavit, what sort of 18 is the documentary form?

19 A. So it depends on what stage of the 20 case you're in.

21 At initial intake, it's really kind 22 of a decision tree that you design for intake 23 call centers. If this, then that. And we build 24 in all sorts of traps, in effect.

Have you ever heard of the Minnesota

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 And you testified in April, and you gave a similar answer sort of just now about wanting to have a process that would allow you 5 to get to a group of cases that are the ones --6 I think the phrase that you used in April was 7 that "you would want to handle."

Page 51

Page 52

8 And just now, you kind of made a similar reference to cases that you would want to sort of -- you would want to be pursuing.

What are the types of cases that the 11 12 Watts firm wants to handle with respect to talc? 13

A. Cases that meet the intake criteria.

14 Q. Okay.

> How many of your firm's approximately 16,935 clients are ovarian cancer claims?

17 A. I think I gave that number in my previous deposition. And it, you know, I think 18 we've got it looped in, pursuant to Mr. Onder 20 and Mr. Itkin's intake criteria, into a broader 21 gynecologic versus meso.

I have not, because we're in the 23 process, gone through and subdivided the gynecologics into ovarian versus this versus 25 that.

Page 50

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 Multiphasic Personality test, the MMPI and the 3 like?

4 Q. Yes.

5 You know, I put on a lot of Α. 6 psychologists, you know, in personal injury cases over the years. 7

You're looking to design a script 8 9 that, in effect, gets all the information you 10 need, has verification traps, has traps for 11 fraud, you know, things that people can't think 12 about that just don't make any sense.

13 And so we design that very carefully 14 in each of these cases because every case that 15 filters through, those 277 don't make anybody 16 any money. That's a waste of my time.

17 And so we have an intake criteria 18 that, in this case, was borrowed from Mr. Itkin, 19 who borrowed his from Mr. Onder.

20 And it felt like it was important 21 that the three firms all have a similar intake 22 criteria. And so we used that trap, and then 23 built our own, you know, intake design questions 24 and the like. 25 Q. Okay.

MIKAL C. WATTS

Q. Okay.

And that really is where my question 3 is going, Mr. Watts, as you may have 4 anticipated.

6 A. Sure.

7 I'm trying to understand, sort of get inside a little bit what the gynecologic category is. 9

10 And I appreciate the answer that you just gave, but let me ask more precisely, do you know the number of your clients whose disease is uterine cancer? 13

14 A. No. The answer is, is inside the 15 database, there's probably information in that regard, but it's very fluid as we continue to go through these tens of thousands of records. 17

18 Look, I understand that there is a 19 disagreement among the different constituency as 20 to what should qualify and what doesn't. And so 21 we are obviously trying to trap that data. 22

But as I sit here today, you know, 23 our intake was based upon a gynecologic criteria that came from Mr. Itkin, which came from 25 Mr. Onder.

Ded Mikal Watts June 12, 2023

Page 55

Page 56

Page 53

1

4

19

20

22

23

24

25

8

19

20

22

MIKAL C. WATTS

Q. Okay.

1

2

3 And if you wanted to, if you wanted 4 to task someone at your firm with the project of 5 coming to a number on the number of clients --6 the number of your talc clients who had, let's 7 say, for example, cervical cancer as their 8 disease, you could find that information out 9 from your database, correct?

10 A. Well, it wouldn't -- it wouldn't be 11 very useful right now because we're in process, 12 but at a certain point in time, we will be 13 complete, and then at that point, we can do

14 that. 15 We use a lot of different ways. You 16 know, there's all sorts of artificial

17 intelligence now that will allow you to go

18 through reams of medical records and look for

19 phrases and this and that on all this stuff. So

20 we'll utilize that to be able to trap different

21 qualifications, and, of course, you'll have to

22 at the time that the trustee or the special 23 master is allocating, right, because you're

24 going to be in a different point system and the

25 like.

1

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 with respect to a lot of clients, you get records that lead to a second or a third order.

Yeah, it's what mass tort departments

do. There's hundreds of people that do this across 15, 20 different torts at a time, that, you know, receive those records from records retrieval vendors, do a certain evaluation that is, you know, very much something that I'm not 10 particularly familiar with, other than they follow my direction as to what I want them to do, you know. And then they keep going, and 12 13 then I get records, like, of what I just got

you, number of records received, this, that. 14 15 You know, I'm more looking at a top-line view.

Q. Let me ask you this, sir. 16 You mentioned that more records are 17 18 coming in?

A. Sure.

Q. That there's a process that's underway. You don't know, as you sit here 21 today, the sort of breakdown within the gynecologic, you know, quote/unquote, gynecologic category.

What number of the 16,935 claims that

Page 54

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 But right now what we're doing is we're going through -- my people are tasked for, you know, I gave you an intake criteria, I need to know the people that have done that.

5 6 At some point in time, you're 7 absolutely right. We'll be able to run those 8 traps after all the medical records are in and 9 the like. Because we've got -- there's a firm 10 called Pattern that we use a lot, which is 11 basically an Al search of medical records. But 12 there's no point in doing it until the records 13 are all in, right? So they're more of an 14 records evaluator, as opposed to a records

15 receiver. 16 Q. And you testified earlier, and in 17 April as well, about the thousands of records

18 that have come in. When you say just now that 19 it's sort of "in process," is the process that 20 remains somebody, whether it's a person or an Al 21 sort of approach looking at the records that are 22 in? Is that the process that you're referring

24 A. Well, let me -- we're still in 25 process of ordering additional records, because MIKAL C. WATTS

are identified in the exhibit that we're looking at on the screen are you confident, as you sit here today, are valid claims that the Watts

Guerra firm has run to ground and says, this is

a claim that we will be pursuing? 7 MR. RASMUSSEN: Objection to the form

of the question.

Q. You can answer, sir.

9 10 A. Yeah, so if you set forth the very clear division of thought between certain people 11 on the TCC and certain people not on the TCC anymore about what's a valid claim, that leads 13 to the question of what gynecologic cancers that don't meet the Birchfield criteria for 15 16 particularized epithelial ovarian cancer will 17 qualify. 18

And so we're going to have to have that debate with respect to studies, with respect to different types of endometrial cancer, cervical cancer and the like as to what qualifies.

23 And, typically, you know, in 24 settlements like this, that leads to a debate about what's more compensable. In other words,

23 to that's left to be done?

DesMikal Watts June 12, 2023

Page 59

Page 57

1

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 if you were to try this a hundred times, what 3 would more likely be successful a hundred times 4 as opposed to 50 times? And so maybe the kind

5 of cancer that wins a hundred out of a hundred 6 gets double, the kind of cancer that gets 50 out 7 of a hundred.

8 I'm not saying that should the case 9 here, but that's the point. You're just 10 basically grid-building.

11 So our job right now is to retrieve 12 data to allow us to place certain cases in certain subparts of the grid. 13

Does that make sense?

- 15 Q. I understand your answer. I 16 understand your answer.
- 17 A. Okay.

14

3

- Q. In terms of -- in terms of medical 18 19 records that have been ordered, sir, have 20 pathology reports been ordered for all the 21 clients?
- 22 A. I don't know that yet because, 23 typically, you don't order a pathology report 24 until you track down the appropriate treater or 25 the appropriate diagnoser, but that's part of

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 into, hey, I think these are in pot A, these are in pot B, these are in pot C, these don't 4 qualify.

5 Q. You made reference to this, I think, a couple of answers ago, but there are some types of diseases in the context of this case that were previously, at least, considered not compensable, correct? 9

10 A. Well, I wouldn't go that far. And 11 let me tell you what I mean.

12 And this is with all due respect to the federal judge. You know, we live in a 13 bicameral system of justice, as well as 14 15 Legislature. We have state courts and federal 16 courts.

17 And so in one federal court, there 18 were -- there was a briefing done, decisions made as to what was compensable and what was 20 not. In other jurisdictions, there may be other decisions that need to be independently, as a 21 matter of just jurisdiction, assessed. 22

23 You know, we have a lot of people on both sides of this particular debate that work 24 together on other torts, and a federal NDL judge

Page 58

1

3

7

13

14

17

18

19

20

MIKAL C. WATTS

the process for sure.

Q. Okay.

So there may -- there may be some --4 let me just make sure I understand.

I take it that there may be some 6 7 clients, given what you just answered, that you would not think it appropriate to order pathology reports for; is that right? 9

10 A. Well, let me put it this way: If 11 somebody has already signed up with another 12 lawyer, I'm not going to order any records for 13 them, right? I'm going to de-dupe them. 14 If somebody says, I don't want to do

this anymore, we stop ordering records. 15 If, you know, somebody is fraudulent 16 17 or something, and we just say this isn't a real person, we're not going to order records, we're 18

19 just going to get them out.

20 So you start off by DNQ'ing people, 21 so we DNQ'd 277 out of however many tens of 22 thousands. You order records. You qualify 23 people based on records. You keep ordering 24 records to keep going. 25 And then eventually you get them

Page 60

MIKAL C. WATTS

may say X and state courts say Y. 2

And so the fact that one has said something does not mean that other judges not subject to the jurisdictional requirements of the NDL rule don't have their own say.

And, of course, the other thing is, is that decision was made at a certain point in time. You will get subsequent studies that change and affect the Daubert record, and so all 10 of that will be litigated after these cases are able to be filed. 12

Q. Right.

And just cutting through it, that's 15 sort of where I'm going. So my guestion is a little bit, slightly different. Let me give you the context of where I'm -- where I'm coming from with this question.

And I can bring it up on the screen if you'd like to see it.

21 But you testified in April that, and I'm quoting you now, you did a bunch of 22 pre-intake research into this tort, there's no 23 point going after cases that are not 25 compensable.

1

June 12, 2023 Page 79

Page 77 MIKAL C. WATTS 2 rules. 3 MR. MOXLEY: Let's mark -- let's 4 bring up Tab 1, Deane, and let's mark that 5 as our next exhibit, which I believe is 6 Exhibit 3. 7 (Watts Exhibit 3, Plan Support 8 Agreement, is received and marked for 9 identification.) 10 BY MR. MOXLEY:

11 Q. Mr. Watts, what we've marked as **Exhibit 3 is the Plan Support Agreement.** 12 Do you see that on your screen, sir? 13

14 A. I do.

16 17

1

15 Q. Okay.

> MR. MOXLEY: And if you could turn to page 11, Deane, of this document.

Q. Mr. Watts, this reflects that you 18 signed this document on April 3rd, correct? 19

20 A. Yeah. You'll notice on the first page, it's got March 21st. 21

22 MR. MOXLEY: Yeah, let's go back to 23 the first page, if we could, Deane.

Q. I didn't mean to interrupt you, sir. 24 25 Please go ahead.

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 A. As I recall, when I met with Mr. Haas 3 on January the 18th, the subject probably came up, but very, very superficially, as this is the way we did it at PG&E. Sometime in late February - if you want me to pull up my docs, I 7 can get you the exact date - for some reason, February 21 is popping in my head, where I sent them a Plan Support Agreement that was largely a 10 cut and paste from PG&E. And then it sat there for a while. 11

12 And I don't remember any discussions or negotiations about a Plan Support Agreement 13 at all until after Mr. Haas and I got there on 15 the money.

16 And then at that point we had the 17 money and the timing of the money done, and then it was like, okay, now how are we going to go get the votes that we need? And so the Plan 20 Support Agreement came up.

I recall a very specific discussion with Mr. Murdica along the lines of J&J says you're a bad writer, we had to tear it up and start all over again, to which I responded, well -- or Jones Day said, you're a bad writer,

Page 78

21

24

1

7

9

13

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 80

DesMikal Watts

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 A. Yeah. No, I think that, as you know, 3 the way -- particularly in the pandemic, the way 4 most documents are done are through, you know, 5 Zoom negotiations, in effect. I guarantee the 6 first draft of this was March 21st or right

7 around there. And then we changed stuff, and 8 somebody just blew it and forgot to change the 9 date. But the date I signed it was April 3rd.

10 Q. Well, that was one of my questions, 11 sir, was whether there were earlier drafts of

12 this document or if it sort of came to be in 13 this particular form? I know that you've spoken

14 -- let me just strike all that so we ask a clean 15 auestion.

16 I know you testified previously about 17 the genesis of the Plan Support Agreement at your prior deposition, correct? 18

A. Right.

20 Q. Okay.

19

21 And, again, I'm not intending to 22 cover ground we've already covered.

So just for context, who did you 23 24 first speak with about the Plan Support

25 Agreement?

MIKAL C. WATTS

to which I responded, Jones Day is the one that wrote the first draft of PG&E, so call your boss. And, anyway, we moved some stuff and it

5 was different, but it was functionally the same. 6

And so then we had a Zoom meeting, I can't tell you what day, where we kind of went through and moved some stuff around.

But the PSA is very skeletal from the 10 standpoint of the only important thing from the PSA, to me, is the attached term sheet, which gives the terms of the deal, right?

So I wasn't pencil-whipping the PSA in any substantial way because I just looked at it as a Jones Day billing opportunity to move words around. And I say that with all due respect to my friends at Jones Day, but it's 17 just basically an agreement that says, hey, if I 19 sign this, I agree to support and advocate to my clients that this term sheet is something they should support.

MR. MOXLEY: And let's turn to the term sheet. That's page 932 of the PDF, Deane. If we flip to 932.

Q. So this is the term sheet that's

DesMikal Watts June 12, 2023 Exhibit 779 Page 9 of 10 Page 81 Page 83

1

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 attached -- that's attached to the PSA,

Mr. Watts; is that correct?

A. Yes.

1

4

5

Q. Okay.

And there's a grid at the end of 6 7 this, correct? You had that in mind as well in your last answer?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Okay.

11 Mr. Watts, just as a yes-or-no 12 question, did you or your firm send the term

sheet attached to the PSA to any clients? 13

(Unidentified voice interruption.) 14

15 MR. MOXLEY: Sorry, could somebody go 16 on mute, please.

Q. Let me just reask that question, 17 18 Mr. Watts.

19 With respect to the term sheet 20 attached to the PSA, yes or no, did you or your

firm send the term sheet to any client?

22 A. No.

1

8

23 Q. Again, yes or no, sir, did you or

24 your firm calculate the amount any particular 25 client of yours would receive under the term

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 have a proposed \$8.9 billion settlement. We

have to go to the court. We have to get past

motions to dismiss. We have to litigate what

5 the disclosure statement should look like. And

then you're going to get to vote. But you'll be

sent a copy of the plan, sent a copy of the

disclosure statement, and the like. So they

9 know it's coming, but they haven't gotten it

10 yet.

16

1

4

5

6

7

11 Q. Got it. And so I understand why you 12 were clarifying that now.

13 And let me go back to the second question I was asking, just to make sure the record is clear. 15

A. Yeah.

17 Q. Yes or no, did you or your firm calculate the amount that any particular client 18 of yours would receive under the term sheet's 19

20 terms? 21 A. No.

Q. Okay. 22

23 Did you calculate what all ovarian cancer clients would receive under the term sheet's terms?

Page 82

Page 84

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 sheet's terms?

A. It's impossible, no. And you're not 3 allowed to yet in terms of the term sheet.

Q. When you say "you're not allowed to," 5 6 you're not allowed to run a calculation in 7 terms --

A. No, I meant the previous answer.

9 I jumped back.

10 It's my view that under the

11 bankruptcy rules, there's a certain solicitation

12 period, and if somebody starts soliciting -- and

13 the case law, I'll grant you, it's on the fence

14 about whether you can do it with your own

15 clients. But I believe that the more

16 conservative route is to get a solicitation

17 agent the court does under, what is it, 3017(d),

18 get a disclosure statement under 1125, decide

19 when the solicitation period begins under

20 1125(b), and then send it.

21 Because in PG&E, people accused me of 22 soliciting before the solicitation period. They

23 were wrong. But I remember very clearly.

24 And so what I did do is I sent a 25 client update to all of my clients saying we

MIKAL C. WATTS

2 A. You mean all, including other 3 people's clients?

Q. Your clients, sir.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Objection to the form of the question.

A. I don't think you can do that until

you know how many people are participating.

Now, we have -- we have -- you can do some back

10 of the napkins based on, you know, I've read a

lot of about, you know, how many cases there are

depending on who you believe. You know, I know

the principle division. So you can take a

number and divide it by the number of cases and

get an average. But as to who is going to get

what inside of that average, a lot of that

depends on the last two pages of the term sheet 17

and what goes into the plan documents. 18

19 Q. Okay. Mr. Watts, if it's fine with 20 you, we'll take this down. If you ever need it to be brought back up in the course of the 22 questions, let me know.

A. Sure.

MR. RASMUSSEN: Gentlemen, gentlemen, was that Exhibit 3? Just wanted to

23

24

25

DesMikal Watts June 12, 2023 Exhibit 779 Page 10 of 10 Page 85 Page 87 1 MIKAL C. WATTS 1 MIKAL C. WATTS 2 2 clarify. Q. Right. And if the plans -- if the 3 3 plan as filed -- strike that. (Off the record.) 4 4 MR. MOXLEY: Thank you, If the plan that the debtor files is 5 inconsistent with the terms of the Plan Support 5 Mr. Rasmussen. Agreement, you are not bound to recommend it to 6 6 Q. Yeah. 7 7 your clients; is that correct? MR. MOXLEY: Just for the record, 8 MR. RASMUSSEN: Objection to the form 8 Mark, the term sheet was a part of 9 9 Exhibit 3. of the question. 10 10 A. I agree. MR. RASMUSSEN: Yeah. 11 THE WITNESS: It's Exhibit A to the 11 Q. As you sit here today, Mr. Watts, are 12 you allowed to withdraw from the PSA if you 12 Plan Support Agreement, which is Exhibit 3. wish? 13 Q. Mr. Watts, what did you understand 13 MR. WHITNER: Objection to the form 14 that you and your firm were agreeing to by 14 15 signing the Plan Support Agreement? 15 of the question. A. So --MR. RASMUSSEN: And may we have an 16 16 agreement that an objection by one party is 17 MR. RASMUSSEN: Objection to the form 17 an objection for all, Cameron? 18 18 of the question. 19 MR. MOXLEY: We can indeed. 19 MR. WHITNER: Objection to the form 20 of the question. 20 MR. RASMUSSEN: Thank you. A. Yeah, so there have been a bunch of 21 Q. Do you have the question in mind, 21 loaded questions asked in a lot of depositions 22 sir? Do you want me to read it back? 22 23 and, you know, by lawyers that know better. 23 A. I do. And let me just -- I believe 24 The bottom line is all that we can 24 that a man's word is his bond. I gave him my 25 agree to is as counsel who negotiated a word. So whether the writing allows it, I would Page 86 Page 88 MIKAL C. WATTS 1 MIKAL C. WATTS 2 settlement proposal, to advocate for that 2 not do it. I've negotiated, drove as hard a proposal for our clients. bargain as I knew how to drive, got to a number It's no different than, you know, 25 that J&J did not want to pay. And when they 4 5 years ago when I would fly to Detroit or Ohio to agreed to pay it, I had a conversation with Erik 6 negotiate a Ford Firestone case. My client Haas that said, if I go to the board and get 7 wasn't with me. When they got to a number that this, do you promise to support it? And I said 8 I thought was fair, I would agree to recommend yes. And so I'm not going to back off on that 9 that to my client. If the client chose not to 9 commitment that I made. 10 follow my recommendation, there's no settlement, 10 Now, that being said, there are all 11 right? Same thing here, it's just, you know, in sorts of ways that an 8- or 9-page term sheet 12 massive numbers. can be improved in a way that's beneficial for 13 Q. And, well, let me ask you this, 13 everyone. And, you know, I know it was 14 Mr. Watts, by signing this, do you consider frustrating to some of the members of the TCC 15 yourself today to be bound to recommend a plan, when it seemed to be the J&J's stock line, join 15 16 provided that plan is consistent with the terms 16 us, make it better, join us, you know. 17 of the Plan Support Agreement? 17 But the bottom line is just because

18

A. Yes.

19 MR. RASMUSSEN: Objection to the form 20 of the question.

Q. Okay. 21

22

The answer is yes, sir?

23 A. Yes. That's the purpose of the

24 settlement. You have to agree to bind yourself

25 to what you negotiated.

18 something changes or is optimized doesn't mean that it blows up the deal, right? So any way to make the term sheet become a plan that is better 20 21 than what was envisioned in the term sheet, I'm 22 for it.

23 Q. And the Plan Support Agreement -just so the record's clear, the Plan Support Agreement doesn't obligate your client to do